

SUMMARY OF CLAIMS

Claims 4, 6-9, 12-18, 20-26 and 35-59 are rejected. Claims 4, 6-9, 12-18, 20-26 and 35-59 are pending. Claims 4, 6, 12, and 37 are currently amended.

REMARKS

No New Matter

No new matter is added by way of amendment as support is found throughout the specification. More particularly, support is found as follows:

Claim:	Support in specification includes:
4	page 3 line 10 supports scientific articles; page 21 line 5 supports facts as a subset of information; page 10 line 15 supports extracting information
12	page 19 line 34 supports storing natural language; page 13 paragraph 1 supports storing original language
37	page 19 line 34 supports storing natural language; page 13 paragraph 1 supports storing original language
60	page 34 line 23 supports storing contextual information

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

During patent examination the PTO bears the initial burden of supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is necessary for the references to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Applicants believe this burden has not met under §103 for at least the following reasons:

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 12-14, 18, 20-24, 37-43, 46-48, 54, 55 and 57 - 59

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 12-14, 18, 20-24, 37-43, 46-48, 54, 55 and 57 - 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,263,335 to Paik et al (hereafter Paik) in view of US Patent No 6,598,043 to Baclawski (hereafter Baclawski)), in view of the article “The Knowledge Model of Protege-2000: Combining Interoperability and Flexibility” to Noy et al (hereafter Noy), in view of the article “Object Role Modeling (ORM/NIAM)” to Halpin (hereafter Halpin). Applicants traverse the rejection.

A) Halpin fails to teach that verifying that the formatted information, including facts, from the selected articles is correct.

In regards to claim 4, Applicant respectfully contends that amended claim 4 recites limitations not cited in the disclosed art. Application therefore traverse the rejection.

The Examiner notes that the combination of Paik/Baclawski/Noy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of verifying that the information facts extracted from the selected articles are correct; and verifying that the facts extracted from the selected articles are placed in the correct format for storage in the knowledge representation. The Examiner cites Halpin to correct this deficiency.

The verification steps of Halpin are concerned with the proper identification of the objects and whether some facts should be split or recombined (see paragraphs 2-3 on page 6). The verification steps of Halpin do not disclose the amended limitation of verifying that the formatted information, including facts, from the selected articles are correct. Stated differently the question in Halpin is not whether the employee named Adams A actually uses extension 2345, but whether this information is correctly represented as objects, ie, whether an extension is actually a number or whether a person is actually an entity. Because Halpin fails to teach verifying that the formatted information, including facts, from the selected articles are correct Halpin does not repair the deficiency of Paik/Baclawski/Noy. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 and its dependant claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

B) Paik/Baclawski/Noy/Halpin fails to teach the storing the article's natural language in the knowledge representation wherein the stored natural language is selected to provide context for the extracted information, including facts, and wherein the stored natural language maintains the original terminology from the article for the extracted information, including facts.

In regards to claim 60, Applicant respectfully contends that new claim 60 recites limitations not cited in the disclosed art. Specifically not taught in the art is the step of storing the article's natural language in the knowledge representation wherein the stored natural language is selected to provide context for the extracted information, including facts, and wherein the stored natural language maintains the original terminology from the article for the extracted information, including facts (see Specification page 34 line 23 supporting storing contextual information, Speciation page 19 line 33 supporting extracting natural language; Specification page 13 lines 1-25 for support of storing copies of the articles). Applicants respectfully request that new claim 60 and its dependant claims be allowed.

C) Halpin does not disclose that a single person qualified to perform both extraction and verification.

In regards to claim 6, the Examiner has cited Halpin page 6 paragraph 2-5 as disclosure of the method of claim 6. Specifically this is cited for disclosure of a single person qualified for performing both extraction and verification. Applicant respectfully points out that nothing in Halpin calls out that the extraction and the verification are performed by the same person. Halpin does mention a UoD expert (page 6 paragraph 5), but Halpin does not make it clear that this expert has been specially qualified for extraction. Rather, Halpin discusses quality checks performed by the UoD expert after extraction has occurred. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

D) Halpin does not disclose that the extracting steps and the verifying occur in geographically separate locations.

In regards to claim 7 and claim 39 the Examiner has cited Halpin page 6 paragraph 2-5 as disclosure of the method of claims 7 and 39. Specifically this is cited for disclosure of the extracting and the verifying extraction occurring in geographically separate locations. Halpin fails to teach this limitation. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

E) The combination of Paik/Baclawski/Noy/Halpin does not disclose the claim 12 amended limitation of an information extractor that extracts an article's natural language for storage, wherein the information extractor is an application program.

In regards to claim 12, the claim has been amended to include the additional limitation of an information extractor that extracts an article's natural language for storage, wherein the information extractor is an application program. As amended claim 12 has two information extraction steps that result in the storage of two types of information in the second database. These two information types are 1) an article's natural language and 2) a structured finding. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 and its dependant claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

F) The combination of Paik/Baclawski/Noy/Halpin does not disclose the claim 37 amended limitation of assign an article to an information extractor for extraction of natural language from the article.

Claim 37 has been amended to include the further limitation of a server configured for assigning an article to an information extractor for extraction of natural language from the article. The combination of Paik/Baclawski/Noy/Halpin does not disclose the amended limitation. Specifically Halpin fails to contemplate the storage of extracted natural language concurrent with the storage of structured information. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 37 and its dependant claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that they are entitled to a letters patent. Applicants respectfully solicit the Examiner to expedite the prosecution of this patent application to issuance. Should the Examiner have any question, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Attorney Docket No. 27763-703.301) for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2010

By: 

Maya Skubatch, Reg. No. 52,505

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
(650) 493-9300
Customer No. 021971